

Remarks

Claims 24-30 and 48-56 are pending in the application. Claims 24, 48, 51, and 54 are amended.

Amendments

Claims 24, 48, 51, and 54 are amended in a non-limiting way to clarify previous language.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 103

Claims 24-30, 48, 51, and 54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bozich et. al. (US 6,748,285) (hereinafter, "Bozich"), in view of Wake (US 4,796,201). Claims 49, 50, 52, 53, 55, and 56 stand rejected as unpatentable over Bozich in view of Wake, further in view of Serrano-Morales (2002/0049715).

Claims 24-26:

Claims 24-26 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bozich/Wake.

According to the MPEP § 706.02(j), to meet the threshold showing of prima facie obviousness, the prior art references must teach or suggest all claimed limitations. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir 1991).

Examiner has not, respectfully, met the burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness for claims 24-26 because Bozich combined with Wake fails to teach or suggest at least the notion of a label management system that creates "a label record associated with one of the business units, and selectively prints a label at one of the manufacturing facilities based on the label record and the associated business units" (from Applicant's claim 24).

Bozich concerns a packaging solutions management system (packaging referring to cardboard, bags, bottles, etc. (see FIG. 3)). To Applicant's knowledge Bozich does not teach or suggest anything having to do with labels or label management. Examiner references Bozich column 3, line 50-65 as disclosing a management system with a record associated with one of the business units, and Wake column 1, ln 11-18 as teaching or suggesting selectively printing a label or other graphics at one of the manufacturing facilities based on the label record and the associated business units. Wake, however, never discloses printing capabilities at more than one manufacturing facility. FIG. 6, for example, includes a single output device, labeled "CRT/PRINTER." Further, Wake never teaches or suggests even multiple printing sites, let alone multiple manufacturing facilities having label printing capabilities. Since Wake never teaches or suggests a plurality of manufacturing facilities with printing capabilities, it follows that Wake never teaches or suggests selectively printing the label at one of the manufacturing facilities based on various criteria, including the label record and the associated business units.

The Bozich/Wake references thus do not teach or suggest all of the elements or limitations of Applicant's claim 24. Claims 25 and 26 depend from claim 24. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that if the above argument regarding the non-obviousness of claim 24 is accepted, then claims 24-25 are also distinguished from Bozich/Wake because the addition of further limitations to an already non-obvious claim does not negate non-obviousness. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 24-26.

Claims 27-30:

Claims 27-30 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bozich/Wake.

As mentioned above with respect to claims 24-26, to meet the threshold showing of prima facie obviousness, the prior art references must teach or suggest all claimed limitations.

Examiner has not, respectfully, met the burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness for claims 27-30 because Bozich combined with Wake fails to teach or suggest at

least the notion of “printing a label at one of the manufacturing facilities according to the selected label record and the associated business unit” (from Applicant’s claim 27).

Bozich concerns a packaging solutions management system (packaging referring to cardboard, bags, bottles, etc. (see FIG. 3)). To Applicant’s knowledge Bozich does not teach or suggest anything having to do with labels or label management. Examiner references Bozich column 3, line 50-65 as disclosing a management system with a record associated with one of the business units, and Wake column 1, ln 11-18 as teaching or suggesting selectively printing a label or other graphics at one of the manufacturing facilities based on the label record and the associated business units. Applicant first respectfully points out that the language of Applicant’s claim 27 includes selecting one of the label records, and the printing of the label is according to the selected label record. The notion of a “selected label record” is not addressed in Examiner’s office action, and is neither taught nor suggested by Bozich/Wake.

Also, Applicant’s claim 27 includes the notion of “associating label records with the business units.” Examiner says this is in Bozich, but Bozich never mentions labels or label records, so does not then teach their association with something else. Thus, Bozich/Wake neither teaches nor suggests associating label records with business units, as is present in Applicant’s claim 27.

The Bozich/Wake references thus do not teach or suggest all of the elements or limitations of Applicant’s claim 27. Claims 28 -30 depend from claim 27. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that if the above argument regarding the non-obviousness of claim 27 is accepted, then claims 28-30 are also distinguished from Bozich/Wake because the addition of further limitations to an already non-obvious claim does not negate non-obviousness. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 27-30.

Claims 48-50:

Claims 48 stands rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bozich/Wake. Claims 49 – 50 stand rejected under the same section as being unpatentable over Bozich/Wake in view of Serrano-Morales.

As mentioned above with respect to claims 24-26, to meet the threshold showing of prima facie obviousness, the prior art references must teach or suggest all claimed limitations.

Claim 48 includes, inter alia, the notion of “configuration data defining plurality of organizations, each organization having at least one group and at least one output location” and selectively printing “the labels at the corresponding output location for the organizations.” Bozich/Wake never teach or suggest having a plurality of organizations, each having at least one output location, and selectively printing the labels at the corresponding output location. As mentioned above, Bozich does not mention labels, and Wake does not even include the notion of more than one printing location.

The Bozich/Wake references thus do not teach or suggest all of the elements or limitations of Applicant’s claim 48. Claims 49 to 50 depend from claim 48. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that if the above argument regarding the non-obviousness of claim 48 is accepted, then claims 49-50 are also distinguished from Bozich/Wake in combination with Serrano-Morales because the addition of further limitations to an already non-obvious claim does not negate non-obviousness. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 48-50.

Claims 51-53:

Claims 51 stands rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bozich/Wake. Claims 52 – 53 stand rejected under the same section as being unpatentable over Bozich/Wake in view of Serrano-Morales.

As mentioned above with respect to claims 24-26, to meet the threshold showing of prima facie obviousness, the prior art references must teach or suggest all claimed limitations.

Claim 51 includes, inter alia, the notion of “configuration data defining a plurality of organizations and output locations, each organization having at least one group and at least one output location” and selectively printing “the labels at the corresponding output location for the organizations.” Bozich/Wake never teach or suggest having a plurality of organizations, each having at least one output location, and selectively printing the labels at the corresponding output location. As mentioned above, Bozich does not mention labels, and Wake does not even include the notion of more than one printing location, let alone allowing for printing of labels at output locations for the organizations.

The Bozich/Wake references thus do not teach or suggest one of the elements or limitations of Applicant’s claim 51. Claims 52 and 53 depend from claim 51. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that if the above argument regarding the non-obviousness of claim 51 is accepted, then claims 52 and 53 are also distinguished from Bozich/Wake additionally in view of Serrano-Morales because the addition of further limitations to an already non-obvious claim does not negate non-obviousness. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 51-53.

Claims 54-56:

Claims 54-56 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bozich/Wake.

As mentioned above with respect to claims 24-26, to meet the threshold showing of prima facie obviousness, the prior art references must teach or suggest all claimed limitations.

Claim 54 includes, inter alia, the notion of “configuration data defining a plurality of organizations and output locations, each organization having at least one group and at least one output location” and instructions to cause a processor to print “labels at the corresponding output location for the organizations.” Bozich/Wake never teach or suggest having a plurality of organizations and output locations, each having at least one output location, and selectively

printing the labels at the corresponding output location. As mentioned above, Bozich does not mention labels, and Wake does not include the notion of more than one printing location, let alone selectively allowing for printing of labels at corresponding output locations for the organizations.

The Bozich/Wake references thus do not teach or suggest all of the elements or limitations of Applicant's claim 54. Claims 55 and 56 depend from claim 54. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that if the above argument regarding the non-obviousness of claim 54 is accepted, then claims 55 and 56 are also distinguished from Bozich/Wake in view of Serrano-Morales because the addition of further limitations to an already non-obvious claim does not negate non-obviousness. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 54 - 56.

Summary

Examiner has, respectfully, failed to make establish a prima facie case of obviousness, as is required under § 103(a) to sustain a rejection. As detailed above, each claim contains at least one element or limitation that has not been found in prior art references. Applicant respectfully requests Examiner to withdraw the rejection and promptly allow all pending claims. The Examiner is invited to telephone the below-signed attorney to discuss this application.

Respectfully submitted,

July 17, 2006
Date

By: Steven A. Bern
Steven A. Bern, Reg. No.: 57,095
Telephone No.: 651-733-2255

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833